

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting**



**THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 2006
CITY HALL KIVA
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

PRESENT: Mark Gilliland, Chairman
Brian Davis, Vice-Chairman
J. David Hill, Commissioner
William Howard, Commissioner
Kelly McCall, Commissioner
Matthew Taunton, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT: Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner
Debra Astin, Transit Manager
Craig Clifford, Financial Services General Manager

OTHER: Charlie Hales, Project Manager, HDR Engineering

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed the members present as stated above.

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

**Study Session of the Transportation Commission - March 16, 2006
Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission - March 16, 2006
Transportation Commission Retreat - March 30, 2006**

Commissioner McCall noted that the headers need to be corrected to reflect the date of the study session and the regular meeting.

Commissioner McCall noted that the last paragraph on page 3 of the study session minutes states that "Chairman Gilliland enquired how specific the Transportation Master Plan is expected to be in solving issues, adding he is thinking specifically of Chaparral to the east of Scottsdale Road." She felt that the answer in the minutes, that Mr. Meinhart advised that the Transportation Master Plan would be forwarded to City Council, did not address the question.

Chairman Gilliland stated that he knows that the Transportation Master Plan would address that project specifically and a recommendation would be included in that document. He agreed that the minutes should be clarified to reflect that.

Commissioner Howard commented that the immediately preceding paragraph should state that he had expressed doubts about the City's effectiveness in public outreach methods and that he opined that the City tends to focus on having meetings, rather than the result of the meetings.

In response to a question from Commissioner McCall, Commissioner Howard elaborated on his comments. At the study session he had questioned the effectiveness of the public outreach in the transportation startup procedure.

Turning to the minutes of the regular meeting of March 16, Commissioner McCall noted that on page 3 the last sentence of the third paragraph said "The Commission had failed to achieve that goal in this neighborhood." She requested that this be changed to "The City, namely the Transportation Department, had failed to achieve that goal in this neighborhood."

Commissioner McCall turned to the minutes from the March 30, 2006 retreat. On the third paragraph of page 6, the correct reference to the statute is ARS 38-431.02 (K). That statute states that if a commissioner is going to provide a summary of current events, that summary has to be on the agenda. It does not have to specify what item will be summarized, but the fact that a summary will be given must be on the agenda.

Commissioner McCall noted that she would like to discuss that with the other Commissioners. She felt that the Commissioner Comments item should be returned to the agenda. She felt that the summary of current events provided by Commissioner Taunton was worthwhile.

Ms. O'Connor replied that staff would note that this is a topic of interest and could place it on the agenda of a future meeting.

Commissioner McCall requested that the second to last paragraph on page 7 be changed to state "the Transportation Commission must always allow public comment," rather than "provide public comment."

Noting that there are in fact two subsection A's to section 2, Commissioner McCall asked that the fourth paragraph on page 8 specify "subsection A of Section 2-282."

Commissioner McCall commented that the second paragraph following identifies a conflict in how meetings are cancelled. She suggested that the Commission could address this during the bylaw review.

On the second paragraph under Item 3 on page 9, Commissioner McCall felt that the second sentence is unclear and suggested amending it to "It would be a good idea for the Transportation Commission to receive input from the Planning Commission prior to the Transportation Master Plan appearing before the City Council in May." The final sentence of that paragraph should state "because it will be an opportunity for the Council to hear input from the Commissions."

COMMISSIONER HOWARD MOVED THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES AS AMENDED. COMMISSIONER TAUNTON SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Gilliland noted that no members of the public wished to address the Commission.

3. **APPROVAL OF CHANGES TO BY-LAWS AND ORDINANCE**

At the invitation of Chairman Gilliland, Transportation General Manager Ms. Mary O'Connor reviewed the proposed changes of bylaws and ordinances. She explained that the Commission can vote to change its own bylaws and can forward a recommendation to change the ordinances to City Council.

With regard to the bylaws, the section under the organization of the Commission currently calls for a Commission secretary who would perform secretarial duties. Throughout the document, the term "Secretary" is replaced with the term "Commission Coordinator", to reflect the position that supports the Commission's administrative efforts.

Section 2-201 on regular meetings replaces the term "shall" with regard to the day of the month at which the meeting shall be held, with the term "are generally to be held." This allows the Commission to modify the meeting schedule from the third Thursday of each month if necessary. It also eliminates the provision that requires that meetings be cancelled by a majority vote.

Section 205 on member attendance currently reads that a Commission member who is absent from five meetings within a six-month period shall automatically vacate his office. The revised language allows for the presence of exceptional circumstances and that the Chair would decide what constitutes an exceptional circumstance.

Under "written communications related to rules and amendments" in section 404, the language is modified to reflect that any written communications to outside groups shall be sent over the signature of the Vice-Chair or the Chair, representing the Transportation Commission.

Ms. O'Connor suggested that at its next meeting the Commission consider some specific language regarding Roberts Rules of Order in section 403, which had been inadvertently omitted from the modifications presented to the Commission tonight.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked about gender-neutral language to refer to Commissioners in section 205. Ms. O'Connor replied that the Commission could make that change before adopting the changes to the bylaws.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked how the provisions of that section would function. Ms. O'Connor explained that the Chairman can decide if a Commissioner is absent because of exceptional circumstances. Staff might assist in ascertaining the circumstances. Vice-Chairman Davis noted that this determination must be made ahead of time, because the provision is otherwise automatic.

Commissioner McCall commented that section 105 states that "it shall be the duty of the Commission Coordinator to the Transportation Commission." She felt that it would be preferable to state "it shall be the duty of the Transportation Commission Coordinator."

Commissioner McCall noted that on page 2, section 201, she would like to insert the phrase "in as timely a manner as possible," to the provisions for canceling Commission meetings, noting that the Open Meeting Law requires at least 24 hours' notice.

Commissioner McCall suggested that when reference is made to 24 hours or 48 hours, they should insert "excluding weekends and City holidays." Ms. O'Connor noted that no one from the City Attorney's Office was in attendance. She undertook to take the comments to the City Attorney's Office for appropriate language to be drafted.

Commissioner McCall asked for clarification of the language in the first sentence in section 202, relating to scheduling special meetings. Ms. O'Connor undertook to ask the City Attorney's Office for clarification.

Commissioner McCall noted a typographical error in the third line from the bottom of that paragraph. It should read "or of a majority." In section 204, she noted that the word "Chairman" should be "Chair." In section 206, which states "the Chair may upon a showing of good cause suspend this rule on a particular matter, or for a particular individual." She opined that the bylaw should make it clear that this means that the Chair may allow a longer presentation. Otherwise the rule might be interpreted to mean that the presentation could be disallowed.

Commissioner McCall remarked that section 303, public record, has been changed to "by the Commission Coordinator of the Commission." She suggested amending that to "the Commission Coordinator." In section 402 the wording excluding weekends and holidays could be inserted. She noted that section 404 could be misinterpreted. It states "All written communications to outside groups shall be sent over the signature of the Chair or Vice-Chair in representation." She noted that an individual Commissioner might write to an outside group and suggested changing the wording to "All written communications to outside groups in representation of the Transportation Commission shall be sent over the signature of the Chair or Vice-Chair."

Commissioner McCall added that she wanted to bring before her fellow Commissioners something to assist with the rules of personal conduct. It would be helpful to assist Commission members with the appearance of being lobbied. Perhaps the bylaws should contain a statement to the effect that the opinions of an individual Commissioner do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Transportation Commission.

Ms. O'Connor advised Commissioners that City Council recently reviewed ethics recommendations prepared by an ad hoc Task Force, that will apply to all appointed Boards including the Transportation Commission. Staff intends to bring these before the Commission at a later date. She noted that some of the communications style issues might not be covered by the provisions of the Ethics Task Force. Staff can work on language to be reviewed at the next meeting.

Commissioner McCall asked for the locations of the public postings of agendas and meeting notices and whether this is efficient. Ms. O'Connor noted that meetings are posted electronically on the City's website, as well as in hard copy at various locations. Staff are working to post additional information on the website so that members of the public can review the packets prior to the meeting. If citizens wish, staff can also put them on the list to receive information by mail.

Commissioner McCall complimented staff on the website.

4. **PROPOSITION 402**

Mr. Craig Clifford, Financial Services General Manager, presented the Commission with a brief overview of Proposition 402, slated for the May 16 ballot. He explained that this is not a tax override. It does not raise or change revenues. Proposition 402 is not a budget issue.

Mr. Clifford outlined the history of expenditure limits in Arizona. The automatic annual adjustments take population growth and price changes into consideration. The expenditure limits do not take revenue changes into consideration. In 2004 voters approved revenue changes for the City. City Council has approved over \$38 million for public safety and 115 new police officers. The revenue is there, the budget process was followed. However, no adjustment was made to the expenditure limit. Mr. Clifford noted that in Scottsdale, capital expenditures are exempt from the expenditure limit. In 1998 another adjustment was made to take changes in City services into account. As new projects are completed and open, the operating costs are not exempt. Examples are the new Senior Center, the Aquatic Center, the CAP Basin ballparks, and the Chaparral Water Treatment Plant. Mr. Clifford stressed that the City planned for the operating expenses in the long-range plan and has the revenues. Equipment such as computers and vehicles is not exempt from the expenditure limit.

Speaking of the consequences if Proposition 402 is not approved and the City exceeds the expenditure limit, Mr. Clifford stated that the City risks losing its share of State-shared revenues. In effect, Scottsdale income taxes would be going to other cities and towns. If the proposition does not pass and the City wants to comply with the expenditure limit, the City budget would have to be cut. The proposition is asking for an adjustment so the City can proceed with its balanced budget and live within existing revenue.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked whether public safety expense is offset by fines. Mr. Clifford replied the revenue from fines is subject to the expenditure limit. Revenues or grants from other governmental agencies are excluded from the expenditure limit.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked what would happen to sales tax revenues such as the Preserve tax, since it cannot be returned to the people who paid it. Mr. Clifford replied that the cost of acquiring land is excluded from the expenditure limit. Some sources of revenue can only be spent on specific items. It might be necessary to cut the spending on those items even though the revenue is there, in order to stay within the expenditure limit.

Chairman Gilliland asked what the original intention of this legislation was. Mr. Clifford replied that intent was to set an overall spending cap for cities – with options or adjustments allowed upon election by voters. Some cities have chosen a “home rule” option where the expenditure limit is the annual adopted budget of the jurisdiction. Scottsdale chose a different option, capital exclusion. The exclusions allow the City to pursue land acquisition for the Preserve and to build capital projects using dedicated revenues and those expenditures are excluded from the limit.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether an external agency review is needed to raise the expenditure limit. Mr. Clifford replied that the legislation sets forth that the State Auditor General will prescribe the procedures. Annually the City reports actual expenditures to the Auditor General's Office after the City's external auditor's review.

5. PROPOSITION 400 STATUS

Transportation Planning and Transit Director Dave Meinhart presented an overview and background of Proposition 400, the extension of the countywide transportation tax approved by voters in November 2004. He presented the regional transportation plan including a map of projected freeways (phase I 2006 - 2010) and an overview of planned improvements to the freeway management system. In Phase II, 2011-2015, more HOV lanes will be constructed. The Scottsdale portion of the system should be completed in Phase IV in 2022.

Mr. Meinhart described planned improvements to the Scottsdale transit system. The first phase involves improvements to Route 72. Other projects include express bus service on Loop 101 going north, a connector for east Loop 101, Park'n'Ride at Shea and Loop 101. Bus purchases are expected to begin in 2006 to support improved service on Route 72 and continue through the life of the program.

In phase II the Camelback Road and the Pima Airpark Express routes will come on line beginning in 2012. Scottsdale Road bus rapid transit is anticipated to come on line in 2013. In 2014, improvements in the Hayden Road, Shea Boulevard and McDowell Road corridors are proposed. Construction of the Airpark passenger facility is proposed in Phase II.

Projects slated for Phase III include: in 2018, the Bell Road - Frank Lloyd Wright Corridor, in 2019 the Indian School Road and Thomas Road corridors. Infrastructure improvements to the Scottsdale Road bus rapid transit are planned for the early stages of Phase III.

Mr. Meinhart noted that an express service coming out of downtown Phoenix to northeast Scottsdale is planned for Phase IV.

He presented a financial summary of the regional transportation plan system and summarized the improvements to transit, roadways and freeways in the plan.

Commissioner Taunton complimented Mr. Meinhart on the presentation and how it was organized. He suggested that the PowerPoint slides summarizing what is planned year by year should be posted on the website as a useful resource.

Commissioner Taunton observed that cities are trying to front money so that projects can be started earlier and asked whether there are restrictions on this practice. Mr. Meinhart advised the Commission that limitations have not been discussed. He noted that the County will not reimburse funds until the year that the project was planned to be funded. He added that if every city were to accelerate freeway construction, they would likely encounter shortages of materials, equipment and labor.

Commissioner Taunton asked about acquiring buses if the City wanted to initiate bus route improvements ahead of the schedule. Mr. Meinhart explained that if the City has savings, in two years they could apply the savings to accelerating some of the bus routes. The Transportation Department is doing everything possible to accelerate transit improvements.

Ms. O'Connor added that some transit service improvements can be made without additional vehicles, particularly extended hours or days of service. This can be implemented without relying on assistance from the regional program, and are in the Department's budget request for next year.

Commissioner Howard asked what portions of the regional funding city savings and capital operations are subject to statutory expenditure limitations.

Mr. Meinhart replied that it would be primarily the City's savings. The City has always intended to use funds that were freed up by Proposition 400 funding to improve City transit services.

Commissioner McCall thanked Mr. Meinhart for another great presentation. She noted a discrepancy in the addition on page 5 of the handout. Mr. Meinhart explained that the numbers put into the plan were expressed in 2002 dollars and then updated each year to account for inflation. He acknowledged that the total may not have been updated and apologized for the inconsistency.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked Mr. Meinhart about the savings the City may realize on some programs. Mr. Meinhart clarified that as a jurisdiction realizes savings, the first \$5 million of savings is kept aside with RPTA.

Chairman Gilliland asked Mr. Meinhart about the Cab Connection program. Mr. Meinhart replied that this is a City-sponsored program that supplements the Dial-A-Ride program for eligible residents. Ms. O'Connor provided extra details about the two programs.

Saying that he had some questions about transportation terminology, Chairman Gilliland asked whether the neighborhood circulator is considered to be a trolley. Mr. Meinhart replied that the Department proposes to use the same type of vehicles as for the Downtown trolley. The trolley that connects the Scottsdale Road resorts with downtown just finished operations for the season. Chairman Gilliland asked what type of buses will be used on the freeway express routes. Mr. Meinhart said that at this point staff anticipate that the buses will be similar to the Phoenix rapid service buses. He confirmed that the City currently does not own any buses of this type. Chairman Gilliland asked about bus rapid transit. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that this is placeholder terminology as the technology has yet to be determined. In reply to a further question from Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Meinhart clarified that paratransit means specialty services, such as Dial-A-Ride or Cab Connections.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether the City has any plans for an extension of Pima Road south of McDowell to McKellips Road. Mr. Meinhart replied that the updated plan, MAG has clarified that corridor will run from McKellips Road to the 90th Street interchange on the Pima Freeway. The City will assess this corridor in partnership with the Salt River Indian Community and ADOT.

Chairman Gilliland asked what will be in place on the Union Hills alignment west of Pima Road after the current construction is completed. Mr. Meinhart replied that this will be looked at in the Transportation Master Plan.

6. NEIGHBORHOOD CIRCULATOR

Transit Manager Debra Astin addressed the Commission. Ms. Astin explained the circulator concept, which is intended to be a user-friendly service.

Ms. Astin presented a draft map of the neighborhood circulator route and identified destinations along the proposed route. She stressed that the route was not designed only for senior citizens. The route is open to the general public. Staff wants to target students and other users. Loloma Station has been added to the route, enabling riders to transit to Valley Metro buses or the Downtown trolley. Ms. Astin explained that the start of the service depends on when the Senior Center opens. The service will run every 20 minutes.

Ms. Astin described the three recent public meetings that were held. Public support for the service was overwhelming. Some concerns were expressed. Two were related to the increased traffic on Oak Street between Hayden and Eldorado Park, and the other was on Granite Reef south of Oak Street. Staff hope to expand this route either to more locations or longer operating hours. Once the service is in operation, staff will do more public outreach. She stressed that this is a neighborhood route and the Department needs to hear from the neighborhoods to improve it.

Commissioner McCall noted a suggestion by the public to allow passengers to board by the trolley garage at 74th Street and McDowell. Ms. Astin shared that this request had come from a volunteer whose service at the Senior Center starts at 7:00 a.m. She will talk with the trolley operator and believes that this should not be an issue. Commissioner McCall applauded this spirit of cooperation.

Responding to a further question from Commissioner McCall, Ms. Astin noted that the circulator service is designed so that people can walk outside and flag the bus instead of having to walk to a bus stop. There will be bus stop signs at a few locations.

Commissioner Taunton remarked that he is firmly in favor of the service. However, he expressed concern with the trolley vehicle. Low-floor vehicles would be easier for seniors and parents with baby strollers to board. Given the route, it can be expected that at times a large number of people will board together, and a low-floor bus would be more suitable. Although starting this service is excellent, he felt that if the service is expanded, consideration should be given to other vehicles. Low-floor diesel-electric hybrids could be virtually silent, addressing noise concerns neighbors had expressed. He added that some routes on major arterials throughout the City operate on an hourly schedule on weekends and that people on those routes may become frustrated. He suggested that improvements on other routes should take place before further improvements to the neighborhood circulator are implemented.

Ms. O'Connor responded that the Department proposes improving the frequency and hours and days of week coverage on almost all City bus routes in the next budget year. On the choice of vehicle, Ms. O'Connor explained that the trolley was initially chosen because it would easily be identified as a circulator service. The Department is considering various ideas for future expansion, such as a combined south Scottsdale-north Tempe service. She cautioned that there are still issues with hybrid electric transit vehicles, which are not necessarily quiet. In light of this, she explained that the trolley provides a good interim solution. Efforts have been made to ensure that the trolley is acceptable to users.

Commissioner Taunton agreed with the concept of unique branding of this service, although he added that this does not necessarily require a trolley to distinguish it from other bus routes.

Commissioner McCall recalled that the trolleys are accessible to the handicapped as they kneel and have tie-downs for wheelchairs.

Chairman Gilliland commented that he felt that although there is a temporary need for a shuttle service between the new Senior Center and the Civic Plaza, he is not convinced that it is justified to provide the service for downtown paid for by all Scottsdale taxpayers.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the concept of circulators is included in the Council-adopted 2003 Transit Plan. The principle is to start offering a service where there is a market for it and to offer high quality service. The long-term plan is to offer circulator services in other areas of the community. She noted that gated and walled communities are not designed for access to fixed route transit service.

Chairman Gilliland noted that it would help him to see it in general broad context, possibly when the Transportation Master Plan is presented. He sees that the general good of the City is served by the Downtown trolley running in a commercial area. He would like to see transit technologies and some of the route ideas come together in the Transportation Master Plan.

Commissioner Howard noted that the Transportation Master Plan should integrate several types of transit. He asked what provisions the neighborhood circulator has for bicycle riders. Ms. Astin explained that the trolleys are built with wide aisles so that conceivably if there are no wheelchairs on board, a bicycle can be brought on the trolley. Noting that Commissioner Howard is the first person to raise that specific concern, she added that there will be a need to accommodate walkers, wheelchairs, and strollers, so bicycles can be included in that procedure. Commissioner Howard opined that accommodating as many different users as possible and broadening out the access is desirable.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked how the routes were selected, noting that members of the public had expressed concern with the route running along Oak Street and Granite Reef. Ms. Astin replied that the City currently has bus service on McDowell, Hayden, Miller, Thomas, and Granite Reef. Staff's goal was to reach new riders and not duplicate service. Serving Eldorado Park was another goal. Ms. O'Connor added that if the route ran along major arterials it would be difficult to allow riders to get on and off at any point on the route.

Vice-Chairman Davis enquired as to the estimated cost of the Neighborhood Connection. Ms. Astin replied that for FY2006/07 it is \$622,000.

Commissioner Taunton commented that the Downtown trolley has not served residents, although it has helped the tourist industry. Given the demographics in the southern part of the City, the Neighborhood Connection will accomplish many different things and is a good starting point.

Commissioner McCall reviewed the many cultural facilities and businesses in the Scottsdale Civic Center area. Having a stop at the Laloma Station will be invaluable and help to reduce traffic throughout the City.

7. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Principal Transportation Planner Ms. Teresa Huish presented information regarding the Transportation Master Plan. Currently the project is at the goals, objectives, and alternative development portion of the process. Staff have conducted many meetings to share information about the Transportation Master Plan and gather public input. At the April 19 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission voted on a text amendment to the mobility element of the General Plan. The intention of the amendment is to coordinate the mobility element with the Master Plan and the transit technology to be selected for the Scottsdale Road corridor.

Mr. Charlie Hales, Project Manager, HDR Engineering, addressed the Commission and described the planning workshop and presented the three different scenarios that were developed. All scenarios build from the General Plan, each one a more extensive implementation of the General Plan.

The first scenario is that in future residents will continue to rely primarily on automobiles for transportation and includes the plans and projects that are currently in the City's Capital Improvements Plan, planning or design, or in the regional plans for

transportation. The second scenario assumes that additional transit alternatives are available. The third scenario provides more transit alternatives, more bike paths, more sidewalks, and more roadway capacity.

Mr. Hales presented maps illustrating the various scenarios and a listing and map of 24 past key decisions that impact transportation in Scottsdale. He described the draft technical criteria for measuring and comparing the performance of the three scenarios.

Ms. Huish mentioned upcoming meetings and events planned for May. Staff constantly update the website. People who have requested information receive e-mail, telephone, or regular mail communications.

Ms. O'Connor stated there will be a staff presentation of these technical criteria to City Council at the May 9 work-study session. Staff will also recommend using the values and goals from the General Plan mobility element.

Commissioner Taunton suggested that neighborhoods should be included in the technical criteria.

Commissioner Howard complimented staff on having run a wonderfully productive charette session. He suggested additions to the technical criteria, to take into consideration how to make it easy to get through Scottsdale, and the fragility of the system, i.e. what happens to the overall system if there is a major accident or disruption at any given point. The unpredictability of traffic congestion is frustrating to travelers.

Commissioner McCall asked staff whether the public has a general feeling of urgency concerning transit, in particular light rail. Mr. Hale replied that at the workshops people raised this issue. In the one-on-one interviews conducted, it was also a very strong concern.

Commissioner McCall commented she is happy to hear that. She followed up with a question about the e-mail list on the website. Ms. Huish said that the list is being used and undertook to check why Commissioner McCall has not been receiving messages. Commissioner McCall suggested that a list of the community working group members be posted on the website. She would also like to see the interview data on the website.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked what steps staff are taking to encourage public participation in the planning meetings. Ms. Huish replied that early in the process, staff realized that they need to go out and meet with the public by going to neighborhood meetings, HOA meetings, etc. Staff will make presentations upon request to any group.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked whether the controversial issues will be on the agenda as separate items. Ms. O'Connor remarked that many of the controversial issues are sub-area issues. Groundwork is just starting on those. Staff will ensure that separate public discussion takes place on these issues. The presentation by Rick Cole at the March 30 workshop is available on DVD and has been shown on Channel 11.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked about the philosophy and techniques at the workshop. Mr. Hales replied that staff wanted to hear all the public's ideas. The ideas collected must now be evaluated in light of the technical criteria and cost considerations.

Chairman Gilliland asked about the extent of the public consultation process. Ms. O'Connor explained that staff want to ensure input from a broad cross-section of the public. Chairman Gilliland commented that perhaps more input at a later stage would be more productive. He asked staff about the process to evaluate the three scenarios. Mr. Hales said that staff use those scenarios as a place to hang individual project ideas. The components of the system have to be analyzed for cost-effectiveness. He added that by inviting public participation throughout the project there will be less surprises at the end when detailed neighborhood plans are drawn up. Applying the criteria to the proposed projects would enable rational decisions about priorities to be made. The General Plan goals and values have to be applied also, after which staff will bring a recommended alternative to the Transportation Commission. Chairman Gilliland inquired whether criteria will be weighted. Mr. Hales replied that staff have not yet determined that. Chairman Gilliland commented that he does not see clearly how the elements will come together and asked how the public will have an opportunity to provide input to the next phase of the planning. Ms. Huish replied that in the fall when staff come back with alternatives, another public workshop is planned, although the format has yet to be finalized. A further discussion ensued on the process.

Chairman Gilliland asked about collision rates and locations. He feels there is an element of safety beyond collision data in terms of security. Mr. Paul Porell said that reducing collisions in Scottsdale is a lofty goal worth striving for. He concurred with Chairman Gilliland's expressions about the potential for disaster with mass transit. The City is engaging in disaster planning. Ms. O'Connor added that the City is training for disaster preparedness. She added that public transit provides evacuation capabilities and could be of benefit in case of disaster. Transit security measures are now a federal requirement.

Chairman Gilliland added that he would be interested to see some measurement of the relationship between the people that use the transit system and the people who pay for it.

Discussing the process, Commissioner Howard opined that nobody is smart enough to come up with the right design for any large system. He mentioned the concept of spiral design, which involves making the best design effort and then adjusting. Commissioner Howard views this process as something which will continue to evolve beyond the currently-defined Transportation Master Plan. The charette had been a good example of evolving design.

Vice-Chairman Davis inquired whether staff are investigating funding sources. Mr. Hales replied that when they reach the stage of the draft plan, financial details will be included.

Vice-Chairman Davis noted that the criteria seem to be focused on transportation. He asked whether there are economic development goals that should be taken into consideration. Mr. Hales replied that they had decided that person-trip access to the

destinations such as downtown or the Airpark was important criteria for the Transportation Master Plan.

Vice-Chairman Davis noted that it might be possible to form partnerships with Phoenix and the Salt River Indian Community to obtain funding. Mr. Hales agreed saying that this was why the leverage provision was included. Ms. O'Connor mentioned that she had distributed copies of the goals and objectives of the community mobility element of the General Plan. Concepts such as neighborhood access and preservation are addressed in these objectives.

Chairman Gilliland noted that to obtain federal funding, one must address environmental measures such as air quality. He asked whether a general environmental criterion has been considered. Mr. Meinhart said that environmental concerns and recognition of natural features are important components of the General Plan. These concerns may not be expressed specifically in the community mobility document the Commissioners received. Ms. O'Connor spoke about the process and the criteria. Chairman Gilliland suggested that they should be included in the community mobility document. Ms. O'Connor undertook to follow up on that.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Dave McDonald of 10888 North 70th Street attended the workshop on Monday but regretted he was unable to attend the charettes. He is concerned with federal funding and how regulations limit the City's planning process. Specifically, under federal criteria, Scottsdale could not qualify for funding for elevated transit system because current population density is too low. He suggested looking at a three-dimensional map of the City showing population density at build out in 2025 or 2030 and comparing it to where the City is today.

Mr. McDonald suggested that energy consumption be measured when evaluating transit options. In terms of public participation, he suggested it would be interesting to have a panel of repeat voters where the same individuals would give their opinions throughout the process.

Although much information is available online, Mr. McDonald commented he does not have Internet access and would welcome planning documents and information on paper.

If he had no other information, Mr. McDonald said he would probably build a light rail system. He would think about starting it at Priest and Washington to integrate with the light rail system, elevate the Scottsdale system and run it through the Galvin Parkway, along McDowell, to Pima Road and then north to 90 Street and to the Airpark. This would offer rail connections to ASU and downtown Phoenix. The whole region is far behind in terms of providing transit.

9. CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT UPDATES

Ms. O'Connor noted that the first annual community bike ride, Cycle the Arts, is scheduled for Sunday, April 23.

With regard to the Pima Acres project discussed at the Commission's last regular meeting on March 16, staff have prepared a draft traffic management plan which includes entry islands, speed tables and roadside landscaping. Representatives from the Fire and Police Departments and Pima Acres have reviewed the plan. A public meeting was held on April 10, which was attended by approximately 50 area residents. She described the outreach and publicity to advertise the meeting. With the input received, staff are preparing a design which should be completed within 90 days and taken back to the same stakeholders, using the same notification methods.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the 96th Street project should be finished in late May.

With regard to the Loop 101 photo enforcement pilot program, Ms. O'Connor reported that no additional warning notices have been sent out. Approximately 12,000 citations and 9,000 notices of violation have been filed. The technical evaluation committee is scheduled to meet in May.

Commissioner McCall commended Ms. O'Connor on the amount of work done towards resolving the Pima Acres traffic calming issue. She inquired how relations between the gated community and the neighbors in the subdivision now stand.

Ms. O'Connor noted that Mr. Porell deserves the praise for the work done on Pima Acres. He addressed the meeting, reporting that the fears about difficulties were a result of lack of communication. Individuals from the three neighborhoods who attended were nearly unanimous in their feelings about the need to address speeding issues in Pima Acres. Mr. Porell opined that this process has perhaps helped to unify the three neighborhoods. Neighborhood traffic management does not have to be divisive and staff are very pleased with the outcome.

Commissioner McCall asked about the delay to completion of the 96th Street project and whether this would increase the cost to the City. Mr. Meinhart stated that the primary factor is production of rubberized asphalt, which cannot be applied in winter and is now in short supply. There are no extra costs to Scottsdale.

With regard to the photo enforcement, Commissioner McCall asked for an explanation of the difference between a citation and a notice of violation. Ms. O'Connor explained that notices of violation are sent to the registered vehicle owner if the vehicle is commercial or if the photo does not match the registered owner.

Chairman Gilliland seconded Commissioner McCall's remarks on Pima Acres. It was great that the problem had been tackled so promptly.

10. IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chairman Gilliland noted Downtown trolley as an action item.

He noted that at the beginning of the meeting, Commissioner McCall had asked about adding the Commissioner comment item to future agendas. This needs to be on next month's agenda for discussion. Commissioner McCall noted she had planned to raise this issue during a discussion of the Ordinance, which did not, in fact, take place. Ms.

O'Connor undertook to speak with the City Attorney's Office before bringing this back as an agenda item, to be sure that correct procedure is being followed.

Commissioner Howard inquired whether there would be a discussion of traffic calming policies at the next meeting. Ms. O'Connor confirmed that this is so.

Vice-Chairman Davis said that perhaps the agenda item should be identified as "Commissioner comments on previous agenda items." Ms. O'Connor said that the issue is to provide more specificity on the agenda to avoid open-ended discussions.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics

***NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on May 18, 2006